

**Remarks**

The Office Action mailed February 23, 2004 has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment has been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 1-20 are now pending in this application, of which claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 11 and 14 have been amended. It is respectfully submitted that the pending claims define allowable subject matter.

The rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 11, 14, 17 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Parent (U.S. Patent No. 6,217,360) is respectfully traversed.

Amended claim 1 recites a low profile cable connector comprising including a mating connector face, and first and second lateral sides extending from said mating connector face; “one of the first and second sides comprising a bail latch retainer thereon configured to receive a pivotally mounted bail latch which is movable relative to the mating connector face,” and a jack screw latch located adjacent the other of said first and second sides.

Parent describe connector locks for locking first and second connectors together, and more specifically for locking a plug (10) and a receptacle (12) together. A mounting bracket (40) is coupled to the receptacle (12) and a mounting bracket (68) is coupled to the plug (10), and the brackets (40) and (68) are pivotally displaceable to align mating portions of the plug (10) and receptacle (12). Applicants further note that as described by Parent, the receptacle (12) is mounted to a chassis (16) and thus in use the receptacle (12) is mounted stationary while the plug (10) is engaged to the receptacle as shown in Figures 8A-8C.

The mounting bracket (68) which the Office Action equates with the recited bail latch retainer of claim 1, does not satisfy the recitations of claim 1. The mounting bracket (68) is mounted stationary to the plug (10) and does not move or pivot relative to the mating connector face of the plug. Thus, Parent does not describe a bail latch retainer thereon configured to

receive a pivotally mounted bail latch which is movable relative to the mating connector face as recited in claim 1, but rather recites a mounting bracket (68) fixed in a non-movable manner to a plug (10) with a screw. It is further submitted that Parent nowhere suggests a desirability of providing a latch retainer configured to receive the bail latch retainer recited in claim 1.

Claim 1 is therefore submitted to be patentable over Parent. Likewise, the detail recitations of claims 2, 4 and 5, when considered in combination with the recitations of claim 1, are likewise submitted to be patentable over the cited art.

Moreover, the features of the bail latch retainer recited in claims 4 and 5 are neither described nor suggested by Parent.

Amended claim 8 recites a low profile cable connector comprising “a mating connector face, first and second lateral sides extending from said mating connector face, and a cable exit extending from one of said first and second sides,” “said first side comprising a bail latch retainer thereon, said bail latch retainer extending substantially perpendicular to said first side and defining a slot extending substantially parallel to said mating connector face, said slot configured for receiving a bail latch which is pivotally mounted for movement relative to said mating connector face,” and “a jack screw latch located adjacent said second side.”

Parent does not disclose a bail latch retainer extending substantially perpendicular to said first side and defining a slot extending substantially parallel to said mating connector face, said slot configured for receiving a bail latch which is pivotally mounted for movement relative to said mating connector face as recited in claim 8. Rather, the mounting bracket (68) coupled to the plug (10) disclosed by Parent extends neither perpendicular nor parallel to the side of the plug adjacent the mating connector face or to the mating face itself, but rather the mounting bracket (68) extends at an angle to each of the side of the plug and the mating connector face.

Moreover, the mounting bracket (68) of Parent does not define a slot extending substantially parallel to said mating connector face, the slot configured for receiving a bail latch

which is pivotally mounted for movement relative to said mating connector face. Rather, the mounting bracket (68) is mounted to the plug (10) via a screw extending through a round fastener aperture (84). Despite the assertion to the contrary in the Office Action, the aperture (84) is not fairly characterized as a slot, and the aperture (84) does not receive a pivotally mounted bail latch but rather a screw.

Also, Parent does not disclose a pivotally mounted latch which is movable relative to the mating connector face of the plug. The mounting brackets (40) and (68) of parent each are mounted stationary to the plug and receptacle, respectively, with screws. Thus, while the mounting brackets attached to the plug and receptacle of Parent may be pivoted by a user to connect and lock the plug and receptacle together (See Figures 8A-8C of parent), neither of the brackets are pivotally mounted. As is shown in Figures 8A-8C, the brackets (40), (68) of the Parent device remain in the same position relative to the plug (10) and receptacle (12), respectively, at all times. Thus, neither of the brackets (40) and (68) are pivotally mounted and movable relative the respective plug (10) and the receptacle (12).

As Parent neither describes nor suggests the cable connector recited in claim 8, claim 8 is submitted to be patentable over Parent. Likewise, the detail recitations of claim 11, when considered in combination with the recitations of claim 8, are submitted to be patentable over Parent.

Additionally, Applicants note that the slot having a neck portion and a head portion as recited in claim 11 is nowhere described or suggested by Parent. Rather, Parent only discloses a circular aperture (84) in the mounting bracket (68).

Amended claim 14 recites a low profile cable connector comprising “a housing defining a mating connector face extending opposite a-top surface which is sloped relative to said mating connector face, first and second lateral sides extending from said mating connector face, and a cable exit extending from one of said first and second sides in a direction parallel to said top surface,” “said first side comprising a bail latch retainer thereon, said bail latch retainer

comprising a hook for retaining a pivotally mounted bail latch,” and “a jack screw latch located adjacent said second side and extending above said sloped surface.”

Parent does not disclose a housing defining a mating connector face extending opposite a top surface which is sloped relative to said mating connector face. It is clear from the Figures of Parent that the top surface of the plug (10) is parallel to the bottom surface wherein the plug interfaces with the receptacle. It is further submitted that Parent nowhere suggests a desirability of providing a top surface with is sloped relative to a mating connector face.

Claim 14 is therefore submitted to be patentable over Parent. Likewise, when the recitations of claims 17 and 19 are considered in combination with the recitations of claim 14, claims 17 and 19 are likewise submitted to be patentable over Parent.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 102 rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 11, 14, 17 and 19 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 3, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Parent in view of Defibaugh et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,842,547) is respectfully traversed.

Defibaugh et al. is respectfully submitted to add nothing to the teaching of Parent with respect to the instant invention, and Defibaugh et al. does not cure the deficiencies of the Parent reference with respect to the claims at issue.

Defibaugh et al. discloses strain relief features for a connector, and notably does not disclose latching features to securely engage the connector with a mating connector. Specifically, Defibaugh et al., like Parent, do not describe or suggest a cable connector having a bail latch retainer thereon configured to receive a pivotally mounted bail latch which is movable relative to the mating connector face as recited in claim 1. Thus, as neither of the cited references discloses or suggests such a feature, Claim 1 is submitted to be patentable over Parent in view of Defibaugh et al.

The recitations of claims 3, 6, and 7, when considered in combination with the recitations of claim 1, are likewise submitted to be patentable over Parent in view of Defibaugh et al.

Defibaugh et al., like Parent, do not describe or suggest a cable connector having a bail latch retainer extending substantially perpendicular to said first side and defining a slot extending substantially parallel to said mating connector face, said slot configured for receiving a bail latch which is pivotally mounted for movement relative to said mating connector face as recited in claim 8. Thus, as neither of the cited references discloses or suggests such a feature, Claim 8 is submitted to be patentable over Parent in view of Defibaugh et al.

The recitations of claims 10, 12, and 13 when considered in combination with the recitations of claim 8, are likewise submitted to be patentable over Parent in view of Defibaugh et al.

Defibaugh et al., like Parent, do not describe or suggest a cable connector having a bail latch retainer thereon, said bail latch retainer comprising a hook for retaining a pivotally mounted bail latch as recited in claim 14. Thus, as neither of the cited references discloses or suggests such a feature, Claim 14 is submitted to be patentable over Parent in view of Defibaugh et al.

The recitations of claims 15, 16 and 18, when considered in combination with the recitations of claim 8, are likewise submitted to be patentable over Parent in view of Defibaugh et al.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103 rejection of Claims 3, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, and 18 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Parent is respectfully traversed.

Claim 20 depends from claim 14, which for the reasons set forth above is submitted to be patentable over Parent. When the recitations of claim 20 are considered in combination with the recitations of claim 14, claim 20 is likewise submitted to be patentable over Parent.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,



Bruce T. Atkins  
Registration No. 43,476  
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP  
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600  
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740  
(314) 621-5070